Jel

BEFORE THE 1 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD STATE OF WASHINGTON 2 3 IN THE MATTER OF LEISURE DEVELOPMENT 4 COMPANY, INC., Appellant, PCHB No. 77-32 5 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, 6 v. CONCLUSIONS OF LAW PUGET SOUND AIR POLLUTION AND ORDER 7 CONTROL AGENCY, 8 Respondent. 9

This matter, the appeal of a \$100 civil penalty for outdoor burning allegedly in violation of respondent's Section 8.06(3) of Regulation I, came on for hearing before the Pollution Control Hearings Board, Chris Smith and Dave J. Mooney, members, convened at Tacoma, Washington on September 7, 1977. Hearing examiner William A. Harrison presided. Respondent elected a formal hearing.

Appellant appeared by and through its President, Edward P. Miller.

Respondent appeared by and through its attorney, Keith D. McGoffin.

Court reporting services were provided by Eugene E. Barker, Olympia

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

court reporter.

 22

Witnesses were sworn and testified. Exhibits were examined. From testimony heard and exhibits examined, the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes these

FINDINGS OF FACT

Ι

Respondent, pursuant to RCW 43.21B.260, has filed with this Board a certified copy of its Regulation I containing respondent's regulations and amendments thereto. Official notice of respondent's Regulation I is hereby taken.

ΙI

Sometime prior to January 26, 1977, Mr. Edward P. Miller, President of the appellant, became incapacitated by illness. As a result, he called upon his son, Mr. Edward F. Miller, to come to Washington State from California to take over supervision of an apartment building project under appellant's control.

III

On or about January 26, 1977, in the course of supervising the construction of an apartment for appellant, the younger Mr. Miller ignited a pile of brush and timber which had been cleared from the site. The site was within an urbanized area as defined by the United States Bureau of the Census. The younger Mr. Miller neither sought nor obtained respondent's population verification prior to igniting the land clearing fire nor was he aware of such an obligation. The senior Mr. Miller was aware of the obligation to obtain respondent's population verification but was confined to his home by illness. The resultant fire was 15 fec

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER by 10 feet by 6 feet, and emitted a plume of smoke. On top of the fire, unbeknownst to appellant, unknown trespassers had discarded pieces of furniture which produced the larger part of the smoke plume.

ΙV

Respondent received a telephoned complaint concerning the fire.

Respondent's inspector arrived at approximately 11:15 a.m. on the day in question, and observed that the dimensions and contents of the fire were as described above. Respondent's inspector then directed the younger Mr. Miller to extinguish the fire, and this was done immediately. At the younger Mr. Miller's order, dirt was pushed onto the fire with on-site construction equipment and the fire department was called to apply water. Formal Notices of Violation (R-1 and R-2) and a Notice and Order of Civil Penalty No. 3177 (R-3) were served upon appellant.

V

The appellant has no prior record of any violations of respondent's regulations.

VI

Any Conclusion of Law hereinafter recited which should be deemed a Finding of Fact is hereby adopted as such.

From these Findings the Pollution Control Hearings Board comes to these

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Ι

Respondent's Regulation I, Section 8.02(3) prohibits the outdoor burning of certain prohibited materials. Although furniture placed on appellant's fire is arguably within these prohibited materials, appellant

FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER

-6

cannot be held responsible where, as here, unknown trespassers added such furniture without appellant's knowledge.

Since appellant is now aware that others may make unauthorized additions to its fires, appellant must take precautions to prevent such activity in the future. Failure to do so, in a future case, may result in the conclusion that the burning of such materials was "allowed" by appellant. (See Section 8.02 which makes it unlawful to "cause or allow.")

ΙI

Respondent's Regulation I, Section 8.06(3) states:

It shall be unlawful for any person to cause or allow any outdoor fire for land clearing burning:

(3) Within the urbanized area as defined by the United States Bureau of the Census unless the Agency has verified that the average population density of the land within 0.6 miles of the proposed burning site is 2,500 persons per square mile or less.

In igniting the land clearing fire, within an urbanized area, without first obtaining respondent's verification that population is sparse enough to allow such a fire, appellant violated Section 8.06(3) of respondent's Regulation I.

III

Under our State's policy of limited outdoor burning, it is not safe to assume that fires may be indiscriminately started on building sites. Before igniting such fires, it is the responsibility of the citizens concerned to become aware of and to adhere precisely to air pollution control rules, such as respondent's Regulation I. Because, however, the violation committed by appellant is its first offense against respondent's Regulation 1, and because of appellant's prompt cooperation in

 25°

extinguishing the fire, the penalty should be suspended for one year. 1 ΙV 2 Any Finding of Fact which should be deemed a Conclusion of Law 3 is hereby adopted as such. 4 From these Conclusions the Pollution Control Hearings Board makes 5 this 6 ORDER 7 The \$100 civil penalty is affirmed, provided, however, that the same 8 is suspended on condition that appellant not violate respondent's 9 regulations for a period of one year after this Order becomes final. 10 DONE at Lacey, Washington, this _____ day of November, 1977. 11 POLLUTION CONTROL HEARINGS BOARD 12 3 14 15 J. MOONEY, Member 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 FINAL FINDINGS OF FACT, ò

5

5 F No 9928-A

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

AND ORDER